REMARKS

1   Claims 1 and 3-21 have been presented for examination
2   in the above-identified U.S. Patent Application.

3
4   Claims 1 and 3-21 have been rejected in Office Action
5   dated November 26, 2004, the Office Action imposing a final
6   rejection on all claims.

7
8   Claims 1, 8, and 12 have been amended by this
9   Amendment C.

10
11 Claim 2 has been previously cancelled.

12
13 Claim 21 has been cancelled by this Amendment C.

14
15 Claim 22 has been added by this Amendment C.

16
17 Claims 1, 3-20 and 22 are in the Application and
18 reconsideration of the Application is hereby respectfully
19 requested.

20
21 Referring to Paragraph 2 of the Office Action,
22 Examiner has requested that that the information
23 identifying the Related Applications be updated. By this
24 Amendment C, this Paragraph has been updated to identify
25 the related Applications.

26
27 Referring to Paragraph 3 of the Office Action,
28 Examiner has requested that the Specification be reviewed
29 to eliminate errors and ambiguities. Corrections to the

1 Specification have been submitted in previous Amendment
2 Letters. No new errors or ambiguities have been found
3 during the preparation of this Amendment Letter.
4
5 Referring to Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Claim
6 12 has been objected to because of a typographical error.
7 This typographical error in Claim 12 has been corrected by
8 this Amendment C. Therefore, objection to Claim 12 has
9 been answered by amendment.
10
11 Referring to Paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8, Examiner has
12 provided an analysis of the relationship of Claims in co-
13 pending Applications No. 09/964158, and Application No.
14 09/964159. As a consequence of this analysis, Examiner has
15 provisionally imposed a double patenting rejection.
16 Because none of the Claims in the related applications have
17 been allowed, the double patenting rejection is
18 provisional. Consequently, Applicants prefer not to
19 address the provisional double patenting rejection in the
20 absence of an allowed Claim. Consequently, Applicants will
21 not respond to the provisional double patenting rejection
22 in this Amendment Letter.
23
24 Referring to Paragraphs 10-14, Claims 1 and 3-21 have
25 been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
26 over U.S. Patent No. 5,845,153, issued in the name of Sun
27 et al., (hereinafter referred to as Sun) in view of U.S.
28 Patent No. 5,796,735 issued in the name of Miller et al.
29 (hereinafter referred to as Miller). Claims 1, 8, and 12,
30 the independent claims of the Application, have been
31 amended to reflect the fact that the UTOPIA interface unit
32 of the present invention can operate in either the master

1 mode, thereby controlling the exchange of data groups
2 between the data processing units, via the communication
3 bus, or can act in the slave mode, responsive to the
4 instructions of the master mode data processing units.
5 This is not a matter of design choice. Because all of the
6 UTOPIA interface units couple a direct memory access unit,
7 they can be the same. For integrated circuits, the
8 implications are clear. Once the circuit unit has been
9 designed and tested, the pattern can be incorporated into
10 the integrated circuit with only the unit-to-unit interface
11 and circuit board real estate being problems. In
12 contradistinction, the typical approach involves a separate
13 design/implementation for both the master mode processing
14 unit and the save mode processing units, along with the
15 corresponding increase in time to design two separate
16 processing units and to test and debug the two separate
17 units. Such a process typically involves at least a few
18 iterative steps to converge on an implementation that can
19 be operative in the integrated circuit implementation.
20
21   This technique of using the same design does not
22 appear in the references. In any implementations, the
23 master mode processing unit is a microprocessor while the
24 slave processing units are typically coprocessors and/or
25 digital processing units. Because of the difference in
26 implementation of the master mode processing unit and the
27 slave mode processing unit, the concept that the interface
28 unit between the processing unit (and the direct memory
29 interface unit) and the communication bus is the same for
30 both the master mode processing unit and the slave mode
31 processing unit is not disclosed by the references.
32

1   Therefore, rejection of Claims 1 and 3-20 under 35
2 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No.
3 5,845,153 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796,735, is believed
4 to have been overcome by the amendment of the independent
5 Claims.
6
7
8

CONCLUSION

1   In view of the foregoing discussion and the foregoing
2   amendments, it is believed that Claims 1, 3-20 and 22 are
3   now in condition for allowance and allowance of Claims 1,
4   3-20 and 22 is respectfully requested. Applicants hereby
5   respectfully request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued
6   for this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

William W. Holloway
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,182

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX   75265
(281) 274-4064
Dated:____08/23/06_____